Office Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
APR 25 1927
WM. R. STANSBURY
CLERK

Number [redacted] 63

In the Supreme Court of the United States

THE KANSAS CITY SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY, Petitioner

vs.

R. E. ELLZEY, Respondent

STATEMENT AND BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

S. P. JONES, Marshall, Texas,
O. W. BULLOCK, Shreveport, La.,
Attorneys for Respondent.

INDEX

Pages

Synopsis and General Statement 1-3

Circuit Court of Appeals correctly reversed case on account of error in charge on contributory negligence. It was the duty of the carrier to protect thepassenger against his negligence, if any there was 2-16

Plaintiff not given full opportunity to object to charge 6-10

CASE SHOULD HAVE BEEN REVERSED FOR OTHER ERRORS

PLAINTIFF'S ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR, APPENDIX A 63

First Proposition:

Plaintiff entitled to peremptory charge 18

Discussed 20

Second and Third Proposition:

Error in instructing plaintiff, a passenger, would be guilty of contributory negligence in urging or acquiescing in fast speed 19

Discussed in detail 28-44-49-61

Fourth Proposition:

Ellzey, a passenger, could not contract against defendant's negligence, and was not guilty of contributory negligence in failing to protest 20

Discussed in detail 45-49

AUTHORITIES

Pages

Boyett vs. U. S. 271 U. S. 104 7

Chunn vs. Washington City Ry Co. 207 U. S. 302 ..... 15, 38

10 Corpus Juris, Section 1490, page 1107; 6 CYC 631 ..... 15, 20

Drovers Pass Cases, including Norfolk So. Ry. Co. vs. Chatman, 244 U. S. 276 ..... 18, 19, 27, 36

Hutchinson on Carriers, 2nd Ed. Sec. 654c 18, 28, 32, 45

Indianapolis & St. Louis Ry. Co. vs. Horst, 93 U. S. R. 291 ..... 19, 27, 41

Inland Sea Board Coasting Co. vs. Tolson, 139 U. S. 558 ..... 15, 20, 38

Lynn vs. Southern Pacific Ry. Co. 24 L. R. A. 710 ..... 18, 28, 32, 33, 42

Little vs. Hackett, 116 U. S. 371 ..... 28, 59

Norfolk Ry. Co. vs. Earnest, 229 U. S. 114 7

Norfolk & A. Terminal Ry. Co. vs. Rotolo, 191 Fed. 4; 112 C. C. A. 583 ..... 15, 28, 38

New York Cent. Ry. Co. vs. Lockwood, 17 Wallace, 357 ..... 19, 27

Pennsylvania Ry. vs. Reed, 60 Fed. 694; 9 C. C. A. 219 ..... 15, 20, 28

Phil. & Reading Ry. Co. vs. Derby, 14 Howard 486 ..... 19, 27

Rodley vs. London, etc., Ry. Co. 1 App. Cases 754, 46 L. I. Exch. 573; 35 L. T. Rep. N. S. 637, 25 Wkly Rep. 147, 9 Centy. Dig.—Title Carriers, Sec. 1354 37

Railway vs. Locke, 17 Wallace 357 41

The Steamboat New World vs. King, 16 Howard, 469 ..... 19, 27

Thorogood vs. Bryan—decided by the Court of Common Pleas, 1849 H. C. B. 114 59

Weisshaar vs. Kimball S. S. Co. 128 Fed. 397; 63 C. C. A. 139 ..... 3, 18, 20, 26, 28, 32, 43, 56, 57

]